UNITED NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1995/131
7 February 1995

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Fifty-first session
Items 25, 12, 8 and 7 of the provisional agenda

FOLLOW-UP TO THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COLONIAL AND OTHER DEPENDENT COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES

QUESTION OF THE REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

QUESTION OF THE REALIZATION IN ALL COUNTRIES OF THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS CONTAINED IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND IN THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, AND STUDY OF SPECIAL PROBLEMS WHICH THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES FACE IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE THESE HUMAN RIGHTS, INCLUDING: PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE RIGHT TO ENJOY AN ADEQUATE STANDARD OF LIVING; FOREIGN DEBT, ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT POLICIES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE FULL ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND, IN PARTICULAR, ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

Letter dated 10 January 1995 from the Ambassador, Chargé d'Affaires, a.i., of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights

I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of the letter from Mr. Vladislav Jovanovic, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, together with the Reply of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in connection with the implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action of the World Conference on Human Rights (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as an official document of the fifty-first session of the Commission on Human Rights, under agenda items 25, 12, 8 and 7.

(Signed) Vladimir Pavićević

CF.95-10768

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA
FEDERAL MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Belgrade, September 1994

Dear Mr. High Commissioner,

I am writing to thank you for the letter of 25 June 1994 that you and the President of the World Conference on Human Rights sent to me in connection with the implementation of its Declaration and Programme of Action, which I understood as your invitation to the Government of FR Yugoslavia to participate and make a contribution to your intended report. I trust and believe that this invitation reflects an attitude that differs from the one taken by the host and participants of the Conference who, politically motivated and misguided by media misinformation, prevented the Yugoslav delegation from taking part in the Conference in a rather insulting way. By itself, such an attitude is incompatible with the very concept of human rights. I am therefore confident that, in promoting the goals and objectives inherent in the high office that you have recently assumed, you will resist the politicization of human rights and refuse to have delegations, like the delegation of FR Yugoslavia, excluded from the work of the United Nations, especially when their respective countries are the subject of a debate or decision-making. After all, let it be recalled, in the past few years the Government of FR Yugoslavia has uninterruptedly submitted its regular, as well as a number of special reports to the Centre for Human Rights on honouring of its obligations under the international instruments acceded to by the SFR of Yugoslavia and subsequently by FR Yugoslavia. I also wish to point out that, in accordance with its decision on the continuity of FR Yugoslavia, the Government of FR Yugoslavia has renounced no international instrument on human or trade union rights and that, wherever required, the new Constitution and relevant legislation of FR Yugoslavia have been fully adjusted to the provisions of these instruments. In point of fact, in some cases these documents even surpass relevant international standards, e.g. minority rights.

I am confident that you personally need not be reminded of the role that Yugoslavia has played in the United Nations since the establishment of the world Organization onwards. The positions of my country on the questions of decolonization, apartheid, maintenance of international peace and security, elaboration and the universal acceptance of international instruments in the field of human rights and universal respect for these rights make an illustrious record and speak for themselves.

H.E. MR. JOSE AYALA LASSO
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
UNITED NATIONS OFFICE
GENEVA

Dear Mr. High Commissioner,

Enclosed herewith for your reference are the comments of the Government of FR Yugoslavia on a number of the provisions of the Declaration of the World Conference on Human Rights. These comments include not only the facts illustrating the manner in which the Government of FR Yugoslavia has observed and implemented human rights, but also, and regrettably so, the sectors, means and consequences of unscrupulous and massive violations of the human rights of our population and the Serbian people in the entire territory of the former Yugoslavia, committed by the international community itself on the very same human rights whose respect it demands.

I would appreciate very much if you would kindly include in your Report both the enclosed reply of the Government of FR Yugoslavia and my letter in their entirety.

Please accept, Mr. High Commissioner, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Vladislav Jovanovicć (signed)

REPLY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

In one of its initial provisions, the Declaration re-affirms the right of all peoples to self-determination and, by virtue of that right, their freedom to determine their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The Declaration goes on to say that peoples may take any legitimate action in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations in order to realize that inalienable right.

Although the disintegration of the former SFR of Yugoslavia was a textbook case of the secession of some of constituent republics from the common State under the influence of some international factors, it was construed as the alleged right to self-determination. The very fact that the seceded republics themselves were multi-national and that the nations living in them were equal nations rather than national minorities, was disregarded. It is therefore totally unacceptable that the republics such as Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina or the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have achieved their independence through the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination, since only one people in each of these republics (Croatian, Muslim and Macedonian people respectively) availed itself of that right, whereas the Serbian people which, under the Constitution of the SFR of Yugoslavia, had enjoyed the status of a constituent people in these republics, has been denied this very right owing to the arbitrary will of both internal and external factors. It should also be borne in mind that, according to Croatian sources,* Serbs account for 12.2 per cent of overall population of Croatia, while in over 60 per cent of the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina the Serbs are the majority population.

In all relevant international instruments, the right to self-determination is linked directly to the equality of all peoples. In the case of Yugoslavia, this same right has been disregarded as far as the the Serbian people is concerned. Another substantial aspect of the right to self-determination has also been infringed. - Initially, the principle of self-determination had been set up with a view to attaining international peace and it had been associated with the countries under colonial domination. Should the exercise of this right lead to internal conflicts or threaten to escalate into conflicts of wider proportions endangering international peace, it could hardly be considered acceptable nowadays, the case of Yugoslavia including.

The principle of self-determination of peoples must not contradict the principle of territorial integrity of states and cannot be pursued at the expense of the latter. The relevant international instruments, including General Assembly resolutions 1514(XV) and 2625(XXV) provide that any attempt aimed at partial or total disruption of national unity and territorial integrity of a country be incompatible with the objectives and principles of the United Nations Charter. That the international community has not changed its position on this matter is evinced by the said World Conference on Human Rights. In the first part of the final document of the Conference, para. 3, in reference to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States (1970), it is stated that the recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination "shall not be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States conducting themselves in compliance with the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and thus possessed of a Government representing the

---

* *HRI/CORE/1/Add.32, 5 May 1994*

whole people belonging to the territory without distinction of any kind." It is peculiar that this case has not been applicable only in the case of the SFR of Yugoslavia.

Paragraph 17 of the Declaration deals with terrorism, its linkage to drug trafficking, its destruction of human rights, fundamental freedoms and democracy, its threats to territorial integrity and security of States and the destabilization of legitimately constituted Governments, with the international community called upon to enhance cooperation to prevent and combat terrorism.

As it is known, one of the most notorious drug routes from Asia to Western and other parts of Europe runs across Serbia. In accordance with its international commitments, Yugoslavia has employed all its available human and material resources to effectively combat drug trafficking. In doing so, it used to cooperate with the relevant organizations of the United Nations system, as well as with Interpol, and it is ready and willing to resume this cooperation, thus making further contributions to their relevant activities once it has been reintegrated in these and other organizations from which it was suspended. Yugoslavia's exclusion from the work of Interpol is incomprehensible, it is against the interests of this organization, all the more so as it is well-known that Yugoslavia has been very effective in interdicting drug trafficking and international crime on one of its main East/West routes. Yugoslavia's achievements and services in combatting international crime have been recognized by Interpol itself, and it is deplorable indeed that this highly professional organization should have succumbed to the politicized isolation of one of its members. Of course, FR Yugoslavia has never comprehended this unjustifiable and odd decision, either as a sign to discontinue its activities aimed at rooting out this scourge of our age or as a licence to make its territory the stamping ground of international mafia. Although suspended from Interpol, with limited resources and under unfavourable circumstances, it pursues to act efficiently, thus contributing to the Interpol effort in combatting international crime.

Yugoslavia's effort in this field is futher complicated by an additional impediment: one of the most powerful world narco-mafias, the Albanian narco-mafia, is very closely connected with the leaders of the separatist movement in Kosovo and Metohija and it finances lavishly the Albanian separatism in Serbia. The Yugoslav Government possesses detailed information on the arming of Albanian separatists with the most sophisticated and diverse weapons bought with drug money. Modern camps have been established in neighbouring Albania close to the Yugoslav border for the training of Albanian terrorists for actions against Yugoslavia, and in favour of its destabilization, with the aim to threaten its security and territorial integrity. Documented evidence is available, including statements made by the individuals trained in the camps in Albania and apprehended by the Yugoslav border and security authorities, as well as the terrorists attempting to cross illegally the Yugoslav-Albanian border in increasing numbers, or in raids against arms caches in Kosovo and Metohija.

Regrettably, for political reasons, the sincere efforts of the Yugoslav authorities to curb these criminal activities have been misrepresented in the United Nations bodies dealing with human rights as the violation of human rights of ethnic Albanians, as intimidation, repression, violation of the privacy, the inviolability of their apartments, etc. The international community bears major responsibility for identifying the right and objective measure between the protection of human rights of one category of people such as minority members who are discriminated against (which is not the case in Yugoslavia) on the one hand, and an unreserved condemnation of internationally unacceptable activities, dealt with in the said paragraph of the Declaration, on the other. Such a condemnation should not be withheld.

In paragraph 10 of the Declaration it is said i.a. that the right to development is a universal and inalienable right and an integral part of fundamental human rights.

Yugoslavia has always attached great importance to this issue, both at the national and international levels.It is a known fact that, together with a number of non-aligned and developing countries, Yugoslavia sponsored and the Yugoslav delegation tabled the Resolution on the Right to Development in UN bodies dealing with the issue.

Pursuant to the request of the Secretary-General of the United Nations of December 1993 and in accordance with the provisions of the Commission on Human Rights resolution 1993/22 and the conclusions of the Working Group on the Right to Development, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has submitted an extensive report on the obstacles to the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Right to Development. Therefore, on this occasion we would present only a part of the facts related to this issue.

The Constitution of FR Yugoslavia, as the supreme legal document of the common State of Serbia and Montenegro, stipulates that FR Yugoslavia is a sovereign legal State, founded on the equality of citizens and the equality of its constituent Republics (Article 1). It proceeds further to say that freedoms and rights of man and citizen shall be limited by equal freedoms and rights of others (Article 9) and that FR Yugoslavia shall recognize and guarantee the freedoms and rights of man and citizen recognized under international law (Article 10). The freedoms and rights of man and citizen shall be exercised and duties fulfilled in accordance with the Constitution. The law may prescribe the manner of exercising some freedoms and rights of man and citizen when so provided for by the Constitution or when required for their exercise. (Article 67)

The economic development of FR Yugoslavia, its scientific and technological and regional development, as well as the narrowing of differences in the level of development of individual regions shall fall within the competence of FR Yugoslavia (Article 77).

The provisions of the Constitution of FR Yugoslavia clearly indicate the presence of all legal prerequisites for the implementation of the basic principles of the Declaration on the Right to Development. Although the Declaration itself is not incorporated in any national legal act, its spirit is reflected both in federal and republican documents on development policies in the social and economic spheres.

Although legally enacted and institutionalized, both at federal and republican levels, the exercise of the right to development in FR Yugoslavia has been thwarted in recent years in the form of collective punishment imposed on FR Yugoslavia for purely political reasons, and it has generated an insurmountable obstacle to development. Accordingly, at the beginning of the closing decade of this century, the social and economic development of Yugoslavia, a country which used to be among the leading countries of Central and Eastern Europe by the size of its economic growth and the depth and dynamics of its social and economic reforms since World War Two, particularly in the 1980s, has come to a halt. Chronologically, this development was brought about by the unconstitutional secession of four former republics of the SFR of Yugoslavia and their hasty recognition by the international community, by the civil war in former Bosnia-Herzegovina which affected the Serbian population in this territory and by the subsequent introduction of unjust and unfair sanctions against FR Yugoslavia by the international community on 31 May 1992, ipursuant to the relevant United Nations Security Council resolution.

The secession of the former republics of the SFR of Yugoslavia and the outbreak of armed conflicts accounted for the closing down of markets, the suspension of foreign exchange and monetary transactions and the erection of physical barriers to the flow of goods and services between the former republics of the SFR of Yugoslavia, followed by the breakdown of the entire infrastructure of the country. As a result of such developments, as early as 1991, the GNP fell from US $ 26,590 million in 1990 to only US $ 23,665 million, i.e. by 8.2 per cent, with a drop of 18 per cent in the industrial production section.

The industrial production in 1992 compared to the year preceding it fell by 21.2 per cent, the agricultural production by 18 per cent, with the same trend further continuing in 1993, at the rates of 37.3 per cent and 7.2 per cent respectively.

The aggregate indicator of economic trends shows that the 1992 GNP compared to 1991 fell by 26 per cent, and it is estimated that in 1993 it fell further by about 30 per cent. The per capita GNP fell from US $ 3,000 in 1991 to only several hundred US dollars in 1992.

It is estimated that under normal conditions, the 1990 GNP could have been accomplished in the 1991-1994 period in the amount of US $ 26.6 billion per year. Even with the assumption of the 1990 annual growth rate of 4.1 per cent, this GNP will not be possible to achieve before 2011.

The greatest part of the calculable damage accounts for the unaccomplished real GNP, plus losses caused by the uneffected net inflow from transactions in invisibles with foreign countries and the additional losses accrued on account of dole disbursements and refugee accommodation costs.

The losses in the 1991-1994 period are estimated at about US $ 45 billion.

The incalculable but certainly immense damage, caused by the disintegration of the SFR of Yugoslavia and the imposed international economic embargo and sanctions, also includes the losses resulting from Yugoslavia's elimination from foreign markets and the costs yet to be paid for its return, as well as from the freezing of its assets and property abroad. From mid-1991 to mid-1993, the number of employed fell by about 10 per cent. Besides, a large number of those who still have an employment are practically idle due to the shortage of raw materials, intermediaries and fuel and, instead of supporting themselves by their wages, they are forced to live on welfare allowances. Average net wages, over US $ 200 in 1991, fell to US $ 80 in 1992 and to somewhat over US $ 30 in 1993. At the beginning of 1994, average net wages amounted to only 26 dinars (1 dinar = 1 DM).

A drastic fall in revenues has gravely affected the domain of pensions, disability pensions, welfare disbursements, child allowances and subsidies to institutions of social care.

Developments in the health field have rapidly deteriorated ever since the imposition of sanctions. There is further deterioration with each passing day, which has resulted in disastrous consequences particularly for the most vulnerable segments of the population (children, pregnant women, the old and ailing, refugees). Against this background of several years declining economic trends, Yugoslavia's infant mortality rate has now begun to rise, even in those parts of the country where the mortality rate used to be at the level of medium-developed countries. The number of deaths caused by communicable and all chronical non-communicable (cardiovascular, respiratory), as well as cancerous diseases has increased due to the very limited possibilities for early detection and adequate treatment.

Last year, additional 2 680 persons died of cancer in FR Yugoslavia owing to the prevailing circumstances. The number of diagnostic procedures has been reduced by 90 per cent, the number of outpatient medical examinations by 50 per cent, with the number of surgical interventions, still the most effective way of treatment, has been reduced by 75 per cent.

The number of examinations and operations on children fell by 92 per cent, with the number of post-operative infections increasing by 30 per cent if compared to previous years.

By imposing sanctions even in the field of health, the international community has trampled upon the best medical traditions and countless provisions of the international humanitarian law, including the 1989 Resolution of the World Health Organization whereby it is explicitly prohibited to use medical embargo for political ends.

The population is suffering from malnutrition. The protein percentage in the diet has been reduced by over 40 per cent, which affects the children and the younger generation in particular.

A substantial number of highly educated professionals have left FR Yugoslavia, most of them young people aged between 21 and 44.

The implementation of the economic embargo measures and isolation has had a negative bearing on the possibility of upholding the principle of social justice. The sanctions have had the most devastating effect on the poorest and most vulnerable segments of the population, for whom the primary health care is ever lesser available.

The Yugoslav experience is closely linked to the contents of para. 31 of the Declaration of the World Conference on Human Rights relating to unilateral coercive measures and has wich in commom with the resolution adopted at the 50th session of the Commission on Human Rights on the same subject, submitted by the delegations of Cuba, China, Ghana and the Sudan, condemning the imposition of embargo, blockade and the freezing of assets, as well as the states imposing them, which states make use of their own predominant position in the world economy. It is therefore quite in place to question Yugoslavia's participation in the efforts of the international community for seeking solutions to problems of economic and social development and in its quest for answers to the accumulated global environmental problems, while at the same time being denied the right to take part in the work of relevant international organizations and fora and in the implementation of the documents adopted within the United Nations; the question is how to ensure, under the conditions of sanctions, non-inflatory and stable growth and ensuing social progress, to fight poverty, introduce democracy or address growing environmental challenges, all of which are the postulates of the right to development as a basic human right; how to service foreign debt and regain financial credibility with its assets frozen, with its foreign exchange, monetary, trade and other transactions abroad being suspended; and, last but not least, how to overcome an ever greater stagnation in development and its effects upon many inculpable generations to come. In short, how can Yugoslavia forestall the marginalization of its people, denied not only its basic human rights but, by extension, the right to life itself.

The threat of sanctions and their indiscriminate imposition and maintenance as a means of policy is becoming an increasingly regular exercise practised by the international community. Although none of the goals intended by the imposition of sanctions have been achieved to date, there is a real threat of their turning into an extremely dangerous instrument in the current process of the establishment of a new world order, with extremely adverse consequences for peace, development, democracy, humanitarian and other proclaimed goals of the international community. Their devastating effects can be hardly differentiated from those of a war conflict.

The sanctions affect not only individual peoples and states; their effects are felt also in the economic, political and social development of entire regions. Moreover, they boomerang on the international community which has to mobilize ever greater financial resources to offset their consequences.

There is no excuse for the international community to turn a blind eye to the consequences of such collective punishment of peoples by way of open violation of the basic rules of international law and basic instruments on human rights.

Paragraph 19 of the Declaration reaffirms the obligation of States to respect and promote minority rights as stipulated in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities. In this connection, the Government of FR Yugoslavia intends to point out that national minorities in FR Yugoslavia enjoy, in full equality with other citizens, all human rights guaranteed in international instruments on human rights, as well as some additional rights, many of which exceed the provisions of the above-mentioned UN Declaration. Yugoslavia guarantees

considerably broader rights to its minorities if compared with the rights granted to the Serb and Montenegrin minorities in the states in which their entity is being recognized.

Under the Constitution, the Federal State and the member republics (Serbia and Montenegro) are defined as States founded on the equality of all their citizens rather than the States of the majority population. It is in line with that commitment that all citizens, whether they belong to the Serb and Montenegrin nation or to any of the national minorities or ethnic groups, enjoy identical human rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

Minority members are guaranteed even some special rights, such as the use of their own language and script, the right to education and public information in their own language, the right to establish educational or cultural organizations or associations, the right to establish and maintain unhindered relations in the country and abroad with members of their nation living in other States, etc. Under the Constitution, FR Yugoslavia recognizes and guarantees national minorities the right to preserve, develop and express their respective ethnic, linguistic and other specificities, as well as the use of national symbols in accordance with international law and, specifically, the provisions on minority rights.

Under the Constitution of FR Yugoslavia, the language and script of a national minority are in official use in the territory where that minority lives.

Every citizen of FR Yugoslavia, whether a member of a minority or majority group, is guaranteed participation in power-sharing at all levels on a footing of equality.

Mutatis mutandis, every national minority in FR Yugoslavia enjoys equal rights irrespective of its number or size. The case of the Bulgarian national minority, presented in this Reply, is illustrative of the overall minority rights status in FR Yugoslavia.

Under the Statutes as supreme legal acts, in the municipalities with the majority Bulgarian population, the Bulgarian language and script are in official use alongside the Serbian language and script. The Bulgarian language is used in all municipal bodies and other organizations exercising public authority alongside the Serbian language. Toponyms and street names, as well as the names of companies and other public entities, are written in both languages. The Bulgarian language is used in written and oral communication between organs and organizations as well as, by citizens, i.e., in proceedings conducted to give effect to, and protect the rights, duties and responsibilities of citizens, in public record-keeping, the issuing of public documents, etc.

In the municipality of Dimitrovgrad with 52.5 per cent of Bulgarians, 22.5 per cent Serbs, 22.4 per cent Yugoslavs and 2.6 per cent of other nationalities, members of the Bulgarian national minority account for 97 per cent of deputies in the Municipal Assembly. The President of the Municipality, the Secretary and the President of the Executive Council are ethnic Bulgarians. 75 per cent of the judges of the Municipal Court are ethnic Bulgarians, as well as the President of the Court; 66 per cent of all those employed in the Department of the Interior, including the Head of the Department, as well as 89 per cent of company directors, are ethnic Bulgarians. In the Municipality of Bosilegrad, in which 72.9 per cent of the overall population are ethnic Bulgarians, all deputies in the Municipal Assembly are ethnic Bulgarians.

Education in minority languages is established at all levels, starting with the pre-school level, to university level. Elementary and secondary schools teach in minority languages if at least 15 students enrol in form one; however, if approved by the Minister of Education, the number of students may be even lower. Bilingual instruction or complementary minority language and culture classes can also be organized.

Instruction in the Dimitrovgrad elementary and high schools is carried out in each of the three possible models provided by law, subject to students' and parents' choice. There

are 1 056 elementary school students, with 93 per cent of the school teachers, as well as the school principal, being ethnic Bulgarian. The high school has 260 students and its principal and 90 per cent of teachers are ethnic Bulgarians. The Dimitrovgrad high school ranges among the best equipped secondary schools in the Republic of Serbia and, apart from the 10 per cent of resources collected via local voluntary contributions, the Republic provided all the finance. There are also two hundred university students of Bulgarian nationality in Serbia.

The Municipal Library in Dimitrovgrad stocks some 30 000 books in the Bulgarian language with the Municipal Library in Bosilegrad containing about 14 000 titles.

Not only is the right of members of national minorities to be informed in their own language guaranteed by the Constitution and laws: the implementation of that right is financed from budgetary means.

The "Bratstvo" Newspaper and Publishing House in the Bulgarian language issues a weekly current affairs review, a children's newspaper and a literary review. The Republic of Serbia subsidizes publishing costs and the salaries of the employees. Radio-TV Serbia broadcasts a 15-minute daily programme in the Bulgarian language (30-minute on Sundays), while Television Belgrade broadcasts a 15- minute weekly newsreel.

Identical minority rights are guaranteed to the members of the Albanian minority as well. But, we are not going to delve into this particular issue on this occasion, since the minority rights of ethnic Albanians have been frequently discussed and extensively covered and interpreted in various human rights fora. The ethnic Albanians are granted rights equal to those enjoyed by all minorities living on the territory of FR Yugoslavia and they are free to enjoy them fully. The reason why they do not always benefit from those rights is their refusal to recognize the State in which they live, or its authority. Under the pressure of their extremist political leaders within and outside Yugoslavia, whose ultimate aim is violent secession from Yugoslavia and the establishment of their own independent State, they boycott the institutions of the State in which they live. Over one hundred foreign delegations have visited Kosovo and Metohija to date and there is no doubt that they have acquainted themselves with the developments in this Province. It is regrettable that their reports are substantially partial for political or ideological reasons, first and foremost in sheer disregard of the basic principle of minority rights documents adopted within the CSCE and the United Nations, according to which national minority members must be loyal citizens of States in which they live. Accordingly, it is the failure of the members of the Albanian ethnic minority in FR Yugoslavia to honour this principle that accounts for all the problems they have in their exercise or non-exercise of the guaranteed minority rights. The international community should take this into account, particularly if it is willing to comprehend the developments under way and to help resolve this problem. The Yugoslav Government reiterates its commitment to settle all outstanding problems through dialogue.

In conclusion, may we recall that in the aftermath of the World Conference on Human Rights, the Yugoslav Government has submitted to the United Nations expert bodies dealing with the implementation of international instruments the following reports: Special Report on the Obstacles to the Implementation of the Convention on the Right of the Child, Special Report on the Implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, a Supplement to the Special CERD report and the First Periodic Report of the Government of FR Yugoslavia on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

In the same period, the Yugoslav Government also submitted reports on religious intolerance, minority rights and the already referred to Report on the implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Development.

These Reports are illustrative of the Yugoslav policy and practice in the field of the protection and promotion of human rights.